

1 JOHN L. BURRIS, STATE BAR NO. 69888
2 Law Offices of John L. Burris
3 Airport Corporate Centre
4 7677 Oakport Road, Suite 1120
5 Oakland, California 94621
6 Telephone: 510.839.5200
7 Facsimile: 510.839.3882

8 JAMES B. CHANIN, STATE BAR NO. 76043
9 JULIE M. HOUK, STATE BAR NO. 114968
10 Law Offices of James B. Chanin
11 3050 Shattuck Avenue
12 Berkeley, California 94705
13 Telephone: 510.848.4752
14 Facsimile: 510.848.5819

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 DELPHINE ALLEN; et al;

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,

22 Defendants.

MASTER CASE NO. C-00-4599 TEH

PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO ENLARGE PAGE LIMIT ON
PLAINTIFFS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER;
DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFFS'
COUNSEL IN SUPPORT THEREOF AND
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Hearing Date: December 13, 2012

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 2, 17th Floor

The Honorable Thelton E. Henderson

**PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION AND
DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL**

I, JULIE M. HOUK, DECLARE:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and am one of the attorneys representing the Plaintiffs in the within action. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and would testify to the same if called to do so in Court.

2. Northern District Local Rule 7-3(c) and 7-4(b) require that the reply memoranda filed by Plaintiffs in support of their motion for appointment of a receiver is limited to 15 pages of text, absent a Court Order to the contrary. Pursuant to Rule 703(c), Plaintiffs are also required to respond to evidentiary objections asserted in the oppositions filed by the City of Oakland within the reply memorandum and not in a separate document.

3. In this case, the opposition memorandum to Plaintiffs' motion that was filed by the City of Oakland was 30 pages in length. In addition, the City of Oakland violated Local Rule 7-3(c) by filing a separate fifteen (15) page, single-spaced document entitled, "Defendants' Objections to Plaintiffs' Evidence in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Appointment of a Receiver," instead of making their objections part of their opposition memorandum. Had the City included its objections in their opposition memorandum as double-spaced text, it would have clearly violated the Court's Order granting its previous administrative motion to extend the page limit for their brief to fifty pages.

4. Plaintiffs previously sought an order enlarging the page length of their reply memorandum which was denied by the Court without prejudice.

5. Due to the number of issues raised by the Defendant in its opposition to Plaintiffs' motion, as well as the fact Plaintiffs must also respond to the fifteen page, single spaced objections to Plaintiffs' evidence filed by the City of Oakland, Plaintiffs respectfully move the Court for an Order enlarging the page length of Plaintiffs' reply memorandum to 30 pages of text instead of 15, to ensure that Plaintiffs have sufficient space to address the issues raised by Defendant's opposition memorandum in the City's improper, separate document setting forth its objections to Plaintiffs' evidence.

6. I declare that the foregoing is true and correct under penalty of perjury. Executed this 18th

day of November 2012, at Dublin, New Hampshire .

_____/S/_____
Julie M. Houk
Attorney for Plaintiffs

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Having considered the Administrative Motion of Plaintiffs and for good cause shown,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT ~~y g'r ci g'rko k'qp~~ Plaintiffs) reply memorandum in support
of appointment of a receiver shall be expanded to 30 pages of text.

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Dated: November 29, 2012

